

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

MARYLAND SHALL ISSUE, INC., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs

v.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Defendant

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

Civil No. 8:21-cv-10736-TDC

**TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR DEFENDANT’S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS’  
EMERGENCY MOTION FOR A RULE 8 INJUNCTION PENDING APPEAL**

INTRODUCTION .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	2
STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	4
ARGUMENT .....	5
I.    Plaintiffs’ Motion Does Not Comply with This Court’s Previous Order .....	5
II.   This Court Should Strike Plaintiffs’ New Factual Allegations and Exhibits .....	6
A. Plaintiffs’ Fourth Circuit Filings Demonstrate Why Plaintiffs’ New and Supplemental Factual Allegations and Exhibits Should be Struck.....	9
B. Plaintiffs’ Interpretation of Rule 8 is Flawed. ....	10
III.  This Court Should Deny Plaintiffs’ Request for Emergency Injunctive Relief. ....	11
A. The Limitations in Chapter 57 Are Not What Plaintiffs Would Have This Court Believe Them to Be .....	11
B. This Court Correctly Concluded That Plaintiffs Are Not likely to Succeed on the Merits. ....	12
1. The County Identified Multiple Historical Analogues for its Prohibition Against Firearms in a 100-Yard Buffer Zone Around Places of Public Assembly.....	15
2. The County Identified Many “Twin” or “Dead Ringer” Laws Prohibiting Guns in Places of Worship.....	17

C. This Court Properly Found No Irreparable Harm to Plaintiffs. ....	19
D. This Court Properly Held That the Balance of Equities and the Public Interest Weigh in Favor of the County. ....	19
CONCLUSION.....	20